

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 23 are pending and rejected.

The applicants amend claims 1, 11, 14 and 21, and respectfully assert that claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 23, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed below.

Rejection against Claims 1 – 10

The applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites a coupling element operable to allow the post to be moved to a position in which the body of the post can not receive an item stored in the compartment and in which the body remains without one exerting pressure on the body. Support for this can be found in at least FIGS. 2 and 3 and paragraphs 11 and 1 of the specification.

The applicants respectfully assert that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over U.S. Patents 5,400,902 (Kaminski) and 6,951,278 (Pettigrew) at least because, unlike the applicants' claimed post, neither Kaminski's post nor Pettigrew's hub remains in a position in which the body can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the body.

FIGS. 2 and 3 of Kaminski appear to show one position of Kaminski's post in which the post can hold a disc, and FIG. 5 appears to show another position of Kaminski's post in which the disc can be released from the post. Although FIG. 2 shows Kaminski's post before it is completely inserted into the disc's hole, and FIG. 3 shows Kaminski's post after it is completely inserted into the disc's hole, the position of Kaminski's post in both figures appears to be the same. Because the post is moved between the position shown in FIG. 2 and the position shown in FIG. 5 to allow the post to be inserted into or withdrawn from the hole of the disc, the two positions shown in FIGS. 2 and 5 appear to be the limits of the post's movement. When Kaminski's post is in the position shown in FIG. 5, one must exert pressure on the post to keep the post in this position. If the finger shown in FIG. 5 is removed from the post, the post will spring back to the position shown in FIG. 2. Therefore, Kaminski's post does not remain in a position in which the post can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the post.

FIGS. 2A and 3A of Pettigrew appear to show a resting position of the hub in which the hub holds a disc 12, and FIGS. 2B and 3B appear to show a depressed position of the hub in which the disc 12 may be released from hub. *See Col. 1, lines 57 – 65.* Because the hub is moved between the resting position and the depressed position to allow the hub to be inserted into or withdrawn from the hole of the disc, the resting and depressed positions shown in FIGS. 2A – 3B appear to be the limits of the hub's movement. As show in FIGS. 2A – 3A, one exerts pressure on the central portion of the hub to move the hub from the resting position to the depressed position. And, as stated at lines 63 – 65, a central portion of the hub preferably functions as a spring to return the hub from the depressed position to the resting position. Therefore, when Pettigrew's hub is in the depressed position, one must exert pressure on the hub to keep the hub in the depressed position. If the finger shown in FIGS. 2A and 3A is removed from the hub, the hub will spring back to the resting position shown in FIG. 2A. Therefore, Pettigrew's hub does not remain in a position in which the hub can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the hub.

Claims 2 – 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1, as amended.

Rejection against Claims 11 – 13

Claim 11, as amended, is patentable over Kaminski and Pettigrew at least for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1, as amended, over Kaminski and Pettigrew.

Claims 12 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 11, as amended.

Rejection against Claims 14 and 16 – 20

The applicants respectfully assert that Claim 14, as amended, is patentable over Kaminski and U.S. Patent 6,799,677 (Marsilio) at least because, unlike the applicants' claimed post, neither Kaminski's post nor Marsilio's hub remains in a position in which the body can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the body.

As discussed above in the arguments for the patentability of amended claim 1 over Kaminski, Kaminski's post does not remain in a position in which the post can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the post.

FIG. 6 of Marsilio appears to show a position of the hub 32 in which the hub holds a disc 30, and FIG. 8 appears to show a position of the hub in which the disc may be released from hub. Because the hub is moved between these two positions to allow the hub to be inserted into or withdrawn from the hole of the disc 30, the two positions shown in FIGS. 6 and 8 appear to be the limits of the hub's movement. As discussed in Col. 4, lines 9 – 23, when a downward force is applied to the hub 32, the hub moves from the position shown in FIG. 6 to the position shown in FIG. 8, and when the downward force is removed from the hub, the hub returns to the position shown in FIG. 6. Therefore, Marsilio's hub does not remain in a position in which the hub can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the hub.

Claims 16 – 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 14, as amended.

Rejection against Claim 21

The applicants' respectfully assert that Claim 21, as amended, is patentable over Kaminski and U.S. Patent 6,535,379 (Smeenge) at least because, unlike the applicants' claimed post, Kaminski and Smeenge each fails to disclose a post that remains in a position in which the body can not receive a disc without pressure exerted on the body.

As discussed above in the arguments for the patentability of amended claim 1 over Kaminski, Kaminski's post does not remain in a position in which the post can not receive a disc, without pressure exerted on the post.

Smeenge's post does not move, and therefore, can not be moved to a position in which Smeenge's post can not receive a disc.

Rejection against Claim 22

The applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's rejection against claim 22 in view of Kaminski at least because Kaminski fails to disclose a locking

element operable to retain a body of a post in at least one of two different positions relative to a side of a storage compartment. The detents 78 in FIGS. 2, 3 and 5 of Kaminski are not locking elements that are operable to retain Kaminski's post in a position relative to a side 22 of Kaminski's storage unit. The detents retain the disc 31 to Kaminski's post when the disc 31 is held by the post.

Rejection against Claim 23

The applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's rejection against claim 23 in view of Kaminski and Marsilio at least because Kaminski and Marsilio each fails to disclose a body of a post positioned below a surface of the storage compartment's bottom.

In FIGS. 2, 3 and 5, Kaminski discloses a lower cover 22 of a disc storage unit. As previously discussed, the positions of Kaminski's post shown in these same figures appear to be the limits of the post's movement. When Kaminski's post is in the positions shown in FIGS. 2, 3 and 5, Kaminski's post extends above the top surface of the lower cover 22. Therefore, Kaminski's post is not positioned below a surface of the storage compartment's bottom.

In FIGS. 5 and 8, Marsilio discloses a bottom wall 40 of a storage container. As previously discussed, the positions of Marsilio's hub shown in these same figures appear to be the limits of the hub's movement. When Marsilio's hub is in the positions shown in FIGS. 5 and 8, Marsilio's hub extends above the top surface of the bottom wall 40. Therefore, Marsilio's hub is not positioned below a surface of the storage compartment's bottom.

Conclusion

The applicants respectfully request the examiner withdraw the rejection against claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 23, as amended, and issue an allowance for these claims.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicants' attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an

Office Action, the examiner call Mr. Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, at any time during the pendency of this application, any required fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.25.

Dated this 24th day of October 2007.

Respectfully submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



John M. Janeway
Registration No. 45,796

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Phone: (970) 898-7244